UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,390	05/21/2001	Andrew D. Padawer	50037.26US1	8902

27488 7590 10/04/2007

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/862,390	PADAWER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, and 33 - 39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, and 33 - 39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 7/09/2007.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, and 33 - 39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 33 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 7/09/2007, Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 33 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/09/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickman et al. (US 5877765) in view of Ivens Kathy (Optimizing the Windows Registry).

In regards to claim 1, Dickman teaches a method for providing shortcuts in a mobile electronic device, the method comprising:

providing a collective application neutral shortcut data store that maintains shortcut data for a plurality of application types, wherein the shortcut data is configurable to include a lookup table, wherein the targets comprise application targets and content targets (See Figure 4, Elements 56, 52, and all the other icons on the screen; Column 11 Lines 30-37);

monitoring user input to the mobile electronic device from a shortcut application (Column 6, Lines 21-48, since Dickman's invention teaches a general operating system it is inherent that it runs on a laptop computer which is a mobile electronic device);

determining whether the user input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a shortcut tag, and further wherein the shortcut corresponds to a shortcut

target in the lookup table (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48);

locating the shortcut target in the lookup table based on the shortcut tag wherein the user input is a shortcut input(See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48);

executing the application when the located shortcut target is an application (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48, i.e. internet browser); and

executing the application and automatically opening the content data when the shortcut target is a content target (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48, i.e. opens the internet browser to a specific web page).

Dickman does not specifically teach a lookup table that includes a plurality of shortcut tag types associated with different types of targets. However, Dickman alludes to using a registry to locate the appropriate client application (See Column 11, Lines 30-47). Ivens further adds,

> HKEY_CLASSES_ROOT is the same for Windows 95, Windows 98, and Windows NT 4. This section of the registry is in charge of three important tasks:
>
> - Keeping track of the file extensions and their associations with file types. A group of file extension subkeys is devoted to this purpose.
> - Keeping track of the programs associated with the file types that are registered in the system. A group of class-definition subkeys is devoted to this information.
> - Keeping track of information about OLE objects and documents. Within the subkey \CLSID are the class identifier subkeys that are devoted to tracking this information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dickman with the teachings of Ivens and include a robust lookup

table (i.e. registry) with the motivation to provide the user a simple and convenient method of accessing many different applications and application types using shortcuts.

In regards to claim 2, Dickman-Ivens teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Dickman further teaches a method wherein the types of targets include at least one selected from a group comprising: telephone numbers, email address, uniform resource locator (URL), and contact cards (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52).

In regards to claim 6, Dickman-Ivens teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Dickman further teaches a method wherein the shortcut input comprises more than one type (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52, the user can either double click to trigger the action or just press enter).

In regards to claim 7, Dickman-Ivens teaches all the limitations of claim 6. Dickman further teaches a method wherein the types of shortcut input include at least one selected from a group comprising: a speed dial input, a voice input, a menu item selection input, and an icon selection input (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52, the user can either double click to trigger the action or just press enter).

Claims 11, 12, 16, and 17 are similar in scope to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, and 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickman et al. (US 5877765) in view of Ivens Kathy (Optimizing the Windows Registry) further in view of Mingot et al. (US 6762692).

In regards to claim 21, Dickman teaches a method for providing shortcuts in a mobile electronic device, the method comprising:

providing a collective application neutral shortcut data store that maintains shortcut data for a plurality of application types, wherein the shortcut data is configurable to include a lookup table that includes a plurality of shortcut tag types, wherein the targets comprise application targets and content targets, wherein the content targets include a target to content data within an application that is navigatable to after the initial launch of the application (See Figure 4, Elements 56, 52, and all the other icons on the screen; Column 11 Lines 30-37);

monitoring user input to the mobile electronic device from a shortcut application (Column 6, Lines 21-48, since Dickman's invention teaches a general operating system it is inherent that it runs on a laptop computer which is a mobile electronic device);

determining whether the user input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a shortcut tag, and further wherein the shortcut corresponds to a shortcut target in the lookup table (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48);

locating the shortcut target in the lookup table based on the shortcut tag wherein the user input is a shortcut input(See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48);

executing the application when the located shortcut target is an application (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48, i.e. internet browser); and

executing the application and automatically opening the content data when the shortcut target is a content target (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48, i.e. opens the internet browser to a specific web page).

Dickman does not specifically teach a lookup table that associates tags with different types of targets. However, Dickman alludes to using a registry to locate the appropriate client application (See Column 11, Lines 30-47). Ivens further adds,

> HKEY_CLASSES_ROOT is the same for Windows 95, Windows 98, and Windows NT 4. This section of the registry is in charge of three important tasks:
>
> - Keeping track of the file extensions and their associations with file types. A group of file extension subkeys is devoted to this purpose.
> - Keeping track of the programs associated with the file types that are registered in the system. A group of class-definition subkeys is devoted to this information.
> - Keeping track of information about OLE objects and documents. Within the subkey \CLSID are the class identifier subkeys that are devoted to tracking this information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dickman with the teachings of Ivens and include a robust lookup table (i.e. registry) with the motivation to provide the user a simple and convenient method of accessing many different applications and application types using shortcuts.

Dickman and Ivens do not specifically teach a method wherein the shortcut tag types include at least one member of a group comprising: a speed dial shortcut tag and a voice shortcut tag. Mingot teaches including voice shortcut tags ("According to a particularly advantageous embodiment of the invention, the voice control makes it possible to access certain functional features directly without going via successive steps as in the case where the buttons of the remote control device are used. In this

case, one will speak of "voice shortcuts". For example, to change the picture display format on the screen and switch to a 16/9 display format (when the current format is 4/3 for example), it is sufficient for the user to utter the words "sixteen ninth" in front of the mike of the remote control device so that the corresponding command is sent to the circuits 52 (FIG. 3) of the television and so that the display format is modified accordingly." (See Column 5, Lines 20-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dickman-Ivens with the teachings of Mingot and include voice shortcut tags with the motivation to provide the user a simpler and quicker method of entering commands.

In regards to claim 22, Dickman-Ivens-Mingot teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Dickman further teaches a method wherein the types of targets include at least one selected from a group comprising: telephone numbers, email address, uniform resource locator (URL), and contact cards (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52).

In regards to claim 26, Dickman-Ivens-Mingot teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Dickman further teaches a method wherein the shortcut input comprises more than one type (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52, the user can either double click to trigger the action or just press enter).

In regards to claim 27, Dickman-Ivens-Mingot teaches all the limitations of claim 6. Dickman further teaches a method wherein the types of shortcut input include at least one selected from a group comprising: a speed dial input, a voice input, a menu item selection input, and an icon selection input (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52, the user can either double click to trigger the action or just press enter).

Claims 31 and 33 are similar in scope to claim 21 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 34, Dickman-Ivens-Mingot teaches all the limitations of claim 31. Dickman further teaches a device wherein the types of targets include at least one selected from a group comprising: telephone numbers, email addresses, uniform resource locators (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48), and contact cards.

In regards to claim 35, Dickman-Ivens-Mingot teaches all the limitations of claim 31. Dickman further teaches a device wherein the shortcut input comprises more than one type (See Figure 4, all the icons on the screens are shortcuts to the applications).

In regards to claim 36, Dickman-Ivens-Mingot teaches all the limitations of claim 34. Dickman further teaches a device wherein the types of shortcut input includes one selected from a group comprising: a speed dial input, a voice input, a menu item selection input, and an icon selection input (See Figure 4, Elements 56 and 52 and Column 6, Lines 21-48).

Claims 37, 38, and 39 are similar in scope to claims 34, 35, and 36 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, and 33-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/09/2007 with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, and 17 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the Applicant's argument that Dickman does not teach a "collective application neutral shortcut data store," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As can be seen in Dickman's Figure 4, there is a plurality of shortcuts on the screen and they all relate to different applications. Therefore the system stores a plurality of application neutral shortcuts. Furthermore, the Applicant reaches the conclusion that Dickman does not teach a "collective application neutral shortcut data store," but does not support that conclusion. There is no explanation of why Dickman does not teach a "collective application neutral shortcut data store."

In regards to the Applicant's argument that Ivens does not teach "a lookup table that includes a plurality of shortcut tag types associated with different types of targets," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ivens teaches, "Keeping track of the file extensions and their associations with file types." The extensions are the tag types and the applications are the different types of targets. Furthermore, the Applicant reaches the conclusion that Ivens does not teach, "a lookup table that includes a plurality of shortcut tag types associated with different types of targets," but does not support that conclusion. There is no explanation of why Ivens does not teach said limitation.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100